

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO. Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.opto.gov.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,560	03/17/2004	Ellen Glassman	SOA-394	5967
23353 7590 667902909 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING			EXAMINER	
			YOO, JASSON H	
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036		1	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte ELLEN GLASSMAN, DAVID FARRAGE, YUMIKO TAKAGI, MICHELLE KOZA, and PAUL H. FEINBERG

> Application 10/803,560 Technology Center 3700

Mailed: June 30, 2009

Before ERIC W. HAWTHORNE, Supervisory Paralegal Specialist HAWTHORNE, Supervisory Paralegal Specialist.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on June 10, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing:

EXAMINER'S ANSWER GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed September 17, 2007, under the heading "Grounds of rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" is either unclear or is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the last Office action of record. The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record, including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions. Furthermore, the Examiner must provide a clear statement of whether examiner agrees or disagrees with the statement of grounds of rejection to be reviewed as set forth in the brief and an explanation of any disagreement. See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

A review of the last Final Office Action identifies a ground of rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph. (Office Action 3). However, the Examiner's Answer fails to identify or provide the status of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Correction of the Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal for all claims is required.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner:

1) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed September 17, 2007;

Application 10/803,560

 to generate a new Examiner's Answer setting forth the correct Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required;

- 3) to include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee (as required for any new grounds of rejection); and
 - 4) for such further action as may be required.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797

EWH/ls

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036